

The Honorable Ricardo S. Martinez

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

MOTOROLA, INC., and  
MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C10-01577-RSM

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]  
ORDER TO STAY ACTION

**Note on Motion Calendar:  
November 8, 2010**

STIPULATION

Plaintiff Microsoft Corporation and Defendants Motorola, Inc., and Motorola Mobility, Inc., collectively (“the Parties”), by and through their respective counsel of record, hereby stipulate and agree as follows:

1. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1659, the Parties stipulate to a stay of proceedings in the above-captioned matter pending a final determination of the United States International Trade Commission (“ITC”) in *In the Matter of Certain Mobile Devices, Associated Software, and Components Thereof*, Investigation No. 337-TA-744.

2. On October 1, 2010, Plaintiff Microsoft Corporation (“Microsoft”) filed a Complaint in this matter. Five days later, on October 6, 2010, Microsoft filed an Amended Complaint, which added Motorola Mobility, Inc. (“Motorola Mobility”) as a defendant. Microsoft served its Amended Complaint on Motorola, Inc. (“Motorola”) on October 8, 2010 and on

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO STAY  
ACTION - 1  
CASE NO. C10-01577-RSM

SUMMIT LAW GROUP PLLC  
315 FIFTH AVENUE SOUTH, SUITE 1000  
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104-2682  
Telephone: (206) 676-7000  
Fax: (206) 676-7001

Motorola Mobility on October 28, 2010. In a Stipulation filed on October 27, 2010, the Parties agreed that Motorola and Motorola Mobility's deadline to answer or otherwise move the Court for relief in this action should be extended from October 29, 2010 to November 22, 2010. The Court so Ordered this extension on November 1, 2010. ECF No. 32.

3. The Amended Complaint alleges that Motorola and Motorola Mobility have infringed, either directly or indirectly, nine Microsoft patents: U.S. Patent Nos. 5,579,517; 5,758,352; 6,621,746; 6,826,762; 6,909,910; 7,644,376; 5,665,133; 6,578,054; and 6,370,566. *See* Amended Complaint, ¶¶ 11-12, 14-15, 17-18, 20-21, 23-24, 26-27, 29-30, 32-33, and 35-36. The same day Microsoft filed its initial Complaint in this action—October 1, 2010—it also filed a Complaint with the ITC against Motorola and in connection with the same nine Microsoft patents, asserting that Motorola has infringed these patents and has therefore engaged in unfair competition or violated Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. § 1337.

4. Eleven days later, on October 12, 2010, Microsoft amended its ITC Complaint to add Motorola Mobility as a respondent. On November 1, 2010, the ITC instituted an investigation based on the Amended Complaint and formally named Motorola and Motorola Mobility as respondents. Thus, at present, Motorola and Motorola Mobility are both defendants in this civil action and respondents in the ITC proceeding.

5. 28 U.S.C. § 1659(a) provides that “[i]n a civil action involving parties that are also parties to a proceeding before the [ITC] under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, at the request of a party to the civil action that is also a respondent in the proceeding before the Commission, the district court *shall stay*, until the determination of the Commission becomes final, proceedings in the civil action with respect to any claim that involves the same issues involved in the proceeding before the commission,” so long as “such request is made within (1) 30 days after the party is named as a respondent in the proceeding before the Commission, or (2) 30 days after the district court action is filed, whichever is later.” 28 U.S.C. § 1659(a) (emphasis added). Motorola and Motorola Mobility are parties to the above-captioned civil action and also the respondents in *In the*

1 *Matter of Certain Mobile Devices, Associated Software, and Components Thereof*, an ITC  
 2 proceeding involving the same issues involved here—the putative infringement of nine Microsoft  
 3 patents.

4 6. This requested stipulation is timely. The 30-day period under 28 U.S.C.  
 5 § 1659(a)(1) did not begin to run until November 1, 2010—the day Motorola and Motorola  
 6 Mobility were “named as [] respondent[s] in the proceeding before the Commission.” 28 U.S.C.  
 7 § 1659(a)(1); *see* 19 C.F.R. § 210.3 (defining “respondent” as “any person named in a notice of  
 8 investigation”).

9 7. Accordingly, the Parties respectfully request that the Court enter an Order directing  
 10 that:

11 A. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1659(a) *et seq.* and the Court’s inherent power to  
 12 control its docket, this civil action is stayed until a final determination of the ITC proceeding in *In*  
 13 *the Matter of Certain Mobile Devices, Associated Software, and Components Thereof*,  
 14 Investigation No. 337-TA-744;

15 B. The deadline for Motorola and Motorola Mobility to move, answer, or  
 16 otherwise respond to the Amended Complaint is vacated; and

17 C. Within 30 days of a final determination of the ITC proceeding in *In the*  
 18 *Matter of Certain Mobile Devices, Associated Software, and Components Thereof*, Investigation  
 19 No. 337-TA-744, and the associated expiration of this stay, the Parties shall confer with each other  
 20 and contact the Court for purposes of setting a Scheduling Order, which shall include the setting of  
 21 a new deadline for Motorola and Motorola Mobility to move, answer, or otherwise respond to  
 22 Microsoft’s Amended Complaint.

DATED this 8th day of November, 2010.

SUMMIT LAW GROUP PLLC

DANIELSON HARRIGAN LEYH & TOLLEFSON  
LLP

By /s/ Philip S. McCune

Philip S. McCune, WSBA #21081  
Lynn M. Engel, WSBA #21934  
*philm@summitlaw.com*  
*lynne@summitlaw.com*

By /s/ Christopher T. Wion

Arthur W. Harrigan, Jr., WSBA #1751  
Christopher T. Wion, WSBA #33207  
*arthurh@dhl.com*  
*chrisw@dhl.com*

And by

Edward J. DeFranco (*pro hac vice*)  
Quinn Emanuel  
51 Madison Avenue, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10010  
(212) 849-7000  
*eddefranco@quinnemanuel.com*

T. Andrew Culbert, WSBA #35925  
David E. Killough, WSBA #40185  
Microsoft Corporation  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond, WA 98052  
(425) 882-8080  
*andycu@microsoft.com*  
*davkill@microsoft.com*

Charles K. Verhoeven (*pro hac vice*)  
Quinn Emanuel  
50 California Street, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
(415) 875-6600  
*charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com*

Of Counsel:

David T. Pritikin  
Richard A. Cederroth  
Douglas I. Lewis  
John W. McBride  
Sidley Austin LLP  
One South Dearborn  
Chicago, IL 60603  
(312) 853-7000  
*dpritikin@sidley.com*  
*rcederroth@sidley.com*  
*dilewis@sidley.com*  
*jwmcbride@sidley.com*

David Nelson (*pro hac vice*)  
Quinn Emanuel  
500 W. Madison Street, Suite 2450  
Chicago, IL 60661  
(312) 705-7400  
*davenelson@quinnemanuel.com*

Brian R. Nester  
Kevin C. Wheeler  
Sidley Austin LLP  
1501 K Street NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 736-8000  
*bnester@sidley.com*  
*kwheeler@sidley.com*

***Attorneys for Defendants Motorola, Inc., and  
Motorola Mobility, Inc.***

***Attorneys for Plaintiff Microsoft Corporation***

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO STAY  
ACTION - 4  
CASE NO. C10-01577-RSM

SUMMIT LAW GROUP PLLC  
315 FIFTH AVENUE SOUTH, SUITE 1000  
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104-2682  
Telephone: (206) 676-7000  
Fax: (206) 676-7001

**ORDER**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2010.

\_\_\_\_\_  
THE HONORABLE RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

***Presented by:***

SUMMIT LAW GROUP PLLC

DANIELSON HARRIGAN LEYH & TOLLEFSON  
LLP

By /s/ Philip S. McCune

By /s/ Christopher T. Wion

Philip S. McCune, WSBA #21081  
Lynn M. Engel, WSBA #21934  
*phil@m Summitlaw.com*  
*lynne@m Summitlaw.com*

Arthur W. Harrigan, Jr., WSBA #1751  
Christopher T. Wion, WSBA #33207  
*arthurh@dhl.com*  
*chrisw@dhl.com*

And by

T. Andrew Culbert, WSBA #35925  
David E. Killough, WSBA #40185  
Microsoft Corporation  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond, WA 98052  
(425) 882-8080  
*andycu@microsoft.com*  
*davkill@microsoft.com*

Edward J. DeFranco (*pro hac vice*)  
Quinn Emanuel  
51 Madison Avenue, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10010  
(212) 849-7000  
*eddefranco@quinnemanuel.com*

Charles K. Verhoeven (*pro hac vice*)  
Quinn Emanuel  
50 California Street, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
(415) 875-6600  
*charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com*

David Nelson (*pro hac vice*)  
Quinn Emanuel  
500 W. Madison Street, Suite 2450  
Chicago, IL 60661  
(312) 705-7400  
*davenelson@quinnemanuel.com*

And by

David T. Pritikin  
Richard A. Cederoth  
Douglas I. Lewis  
John W. McBride  
Sidley Austin LLP  
One South Dearborn  
Chicago, IL 60603  
(312) 853-7000  
*dpritikin@sidley.com*  
*rcederoth@sidley.com*  
*dilewis@sidley.com*  
*jwmcbride@sidley.com*

Brian R. Nester  
Kevin C. Wheeler  
Sidley Austin LLP  
1501 K Street NW  
Washington, DC  
20005  
(202) 736-8000  
*bnester@sidley.com*  
*kwheeler@sidley.com*

***Attorneys for Defendants Motorola, Inc., and  
Motorola Mobility, Inc.***

***Attorneys for Plaintiff Microsoft Corporation***

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO STAY  
ACTION - 5  
CASE NO. C10-01577-RSM

SUMMIT LAW GROUP PLLC  
315 FIFTH AVENUE SOUTH, SUITE 1000  
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104-2682  
Telephone: (206) 676-7000  
Fax: (206) 676-7001